REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on January 26, 2006 has been carefully reviewed, and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 23-37, and 42 are pending in this application. Claims 23, 32, 35 and 42 have been amended.

Discussion of the Telephonic Interview

Applicant's representative thanks the Examiner for taking the time to conduct a telephonic interview on April 18, 2006 to discuss the pending Office Action as summarized above. As summarized in the SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW section above, Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed the relevance of Sahni, U.S. Pat. No. 5,646,986, and agreed that Sahni does not cure the deficiencies of Venturini for at least the reasons discussed above.

Discussion of Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 32-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. The Office Action states the word "if" in lines 12, 15, and 18 renders Claim 32 indefinite. Applicant has amended Claim 32 to more clearly recite the conditions predicate to "setting a divert flag," "associating a CLI signal with the call," and "associating an international origin indicator with the call," respectively. Applicant notes that the predicate conditions differ for each of the "setting a divert flag," "associating a CLI signal," and "associating an international origin indicator." Illustrative embodiments of these claimed features are provided at least at Figure 2 at blocks 22, 26 and 32, and in the specification at page 8, line 8 through page 9, line 3, and a page 9, lines 20-22.

Claims 33 and 34 depend from Claim 32. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 4, they incorporate by reference all limitations of the claim to which they refer. It is therefore submitted that these claims are in condition for allowance at least for the reasons expressed with respect to the independent claims, and for other features recited therein.

Discussion of Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

As discussed above, during the telephonic interview on April 18, 2006, it was agreed that Sahni does not cure the deficiencies in Venturini for the reasons outlined above. The other art made of record also does not show this claimed feature. Accordingly, claims 23, 35 and 42 are allowable.

Claims 24-31, 36-37 depend from Claims 23 and 35, respectively. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 4, they incorporate by reference all limitations of the claim to which they refer. It is therefore submitted that these claims are in condition for allowance at least for the reasons expressed with respect to the independent claims, and for other features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding final Office Action. Accordingly, arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claim set are presented above. In light of these remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested. If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully invited to call the undersigned.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 4/26/06

By: _____

John M. Carson
Registration No. 34,303
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

AMEND

2542779
042106